UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/812,207	03/19/2001	Brian K. Pepin	MS158541.1	9615

27195 7590 09/23/2004

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP
24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER
1900 EAST NINTH STREET
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER	
FOWLKES, ANDRE R	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2122	

DATE MAILED: 09/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/812,207	PEPIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Andre R. Fowlkes	2122	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 June 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *6/16/04*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on 6/16/04.

2. The objection to the information disclosure statement is withdrawn, in view of applicants amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sarkar, U.S. Patent No. 6,012,067.

As per claim 1, this is a system version of the claimed method discussed in claim 19, wherein all claimed limitations also have been addressed, below.

As per claim 2 , Sarkar also discloses such claimed limitations as addressed in claim 18, below.

As per claims 3-7, Sarkar also discloses such claimed limitations as addressed in claims 11 and 19, below.

As per claim 8, this is a system version of the claimed method discussed in claim 19, wherein all claimed limitations also have been addressed, below.

As per claims 9 and 10, Sarkar also discloses such claimed limitations as addressed in claim 19, below.

As per claim 11, the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated and further, Sarkar discloses that component schema stored as **metadata comprises at least one of types, members, attributes, properties and events** (col. 11 lines 54-63, "Component schema and packages talk to each other through object request brokers. A query with table names, attribute names, method names from various component schema is resolved by successive preparations and collaborative executions at different sites over the internet. In practice, SQL query is resolved by first parsing and then executing relational operations over the data stored in tables. Parsing phase consists of recognizing table, attribute and package definitions stored in the data dictionary. This information stored in the data dictionary is often called the meta data").

As per claim 12, the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated and further, Sarkar discloses component schema and packages talking to each other through object request brokers and that **the information provided by the interface comprises at least one of types, members, attributes, properties and events** (col. 11 lines 54-63, "Component schema and packages talk to each other through object request brokers. A query with table names, attribute names, method names from various component schema is resolved by successive preparations and collaborative executions at different sites over the internet. In practice, SQL query is resolved by first parsing and then executing relational operations over the data stored in tables. Parsing phase consists of

recognizing table, attribute and package definitions stored in the data dictionary. This information stored in the data dictionary is often called the meta data").

As per claim 13, Sarkar discloses such claimed limitations as addressed in claim 19, below.

As per claim 14, this is a system version of the claimed method discussed in claim 19, wherein all claimed limitations have been addressed below.

As per claims 15-17, Sarkar discloses such claimed limitations as addressed in claim 19, below.

As per claim 18, Sarkar discloses a method and apparatus (FIG. 1) for storing and manipulating objects in a plurality of relational data managers on the web, and in that Sarkar covers the steps of:

- receiving information regarding an instance of a component (col. 10 line 62-63, "FIG. 8 shows (the exchange of information regarding objects (i.e. components))"),

- determining whether the instance of the component is contained by a container (col. 5 lines 49-51, "comparison operators are definable to compare ... web objects (to determine) ... containment"),

- determining whether any other contained component desires to modify information regarding the instance of the component (col. 5 lines 11-14, "It is a primary objective of the present invention to provide a mechanism for representing and manipulating ... objects (i.e. instances of components)", and a determination of which

component is to be modified by which other component must be made before any modification of the component is done),

- modifying the information regarding the instance of the component (col. 5 lines 11-14, "It is a primary objective of the present invention to provide a mechanism for representing and manipulating ... objects (i.e. instances of components)"),

- determining whether the container implements an interface for manipulating the information regarding **the instance of the component** (col. 5 lines 11-14, "It is a primary objective of the present invention to provide a mechanism (i.e. interface) for representing and manipulating ... objects (i.e. instances of components)", and a proper interface must be determined by the Sarkar invention, before manipulating the information),

- manipulating the information regarding the instance of the component by using an **interface** (col. 5 lines 11-14, "It is a primary objective of the present invention to provide a mechanism (i.e. interface) for representing and manipulating ... objects (i.e. instances of components)"),

- storing the information regarding the instance of the component (col. 1 lines 8-10, "This invention relates to object (i.e. component) management ... for storing and manipulating (information regarding components)").

As per claim 19, the rejection of claim 18 is incorporated and further Sarkar discloses:

- receiving a request from a development tool for information regarding the instance of the component (col. 10 line 62-63, "FIG. 8 shows (the exchange of requests and information regarding objects (i.e. components))"),

- discovering metadata associated with the instance of the component (col. 11 lines 54-63, "Component schema and packages talk to each other through object request brokers. A query with table names, attribute names, method names from various component schema is resolved by successive preparations and collaborative executions at different sites over the internet. In practice, SQL query is resolved by first parsing and then executing relational operations over the data stored in tables. Parsing phase consists of recognizing table, attribute and package definitions stored in the data dictionary. This information stored in the data dictionary is often called the meta data"),

- determining whether the instance of the component implements an **interface** used to manipulate information regarding the instance of the component (col. 5 lines 11-14, "It is a primary objective of the present invention to provide a mechanism (i.e. interface) for representing and manipulating ... objects (i.e. instances of components)", and prior to manipulating the component's information, a proper interface must first be determined),

- invoking the interface of instance of the component, the interface manipulating information regarding the instance of the component (col. 5 lines 11-14, "It is a primary objective of the present invention to provide a mechanism (i.e. interface) for representing and manipulating ... objects (i.e. instances of components)"),

- manipulating information regarding the instance of the component; (col. 5 lines 11-14, "It is a primary objective of the present invention to provide a mechanism for representing and manipulating ... objects (i.e. instances of components)",

- receiving information regarding the instance of the component from the interface (col. 5 lines 11-14, "It is a primary objective of the present invention to provide a mechanism (i.e. interface) for representing and manipulating ... objects (i.e. instances of components), and col. 10 line 62-63, "FIG. 8 shows (the exchange of information regarding the instance of the components)"),

- reporting the information regarding the instance of the component to the development tool (col. 5 lines 11-14, "It is a primary objective of the present invention to provide a mechanism for representing and manipulating ... objects (i.e. instances of components), and col. 10 line 62-63, "FIG. 8 shows (the exchange of information regarding the instance of the components)").

As per claim 20, this is a product version of the claimed method discussed in claim 19, above, wherein all claimed limitations have also been addressed and such a product is deemed to be inherent in the Sarkar invention, otherwise it would be inoperative.

As per claim 21, this is a system version of the claimed method discussed in claim 19, wherein all claimed limitations have also been addressed, above.

As per claim 22, Sarkar also discloses such claimed limitations as addressed in claim 19, above.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicants arguments have been considered but they are not persuasive.

In the remarks, the applicant has argued substantially that:

1) The Sarkar patent is not directed to a component model discovery service for design time, on p. 11:9-11

Examiner's response:

1) The examiner disagrees with the applicants characterization of the applied art. While the Sarkar system is not solely directed toward a component model discovery service, the system does exhibits the functionality disclosed in the instant application (e.g. Sarkar col. 12:42-61, "application logic (is) defined in the form of object packages comprising: ... (a) type definition consist(ing) of variable definitions for methods and operators on these variables")

In the remarks, the applicant has argued substantially that:

2) Sarkar is silent with regard to any system or method of receiving information regarding an instance of a component, on p. 11:17-18.

Examiner's response:

2) Sarkar does disclose accessing information regarding an instance of a component (e.g. Sarkar col. 12:42-61, "application logic (is) defined in the form of object

packages (i.e. components) comprising: ... (a) type definition consist(ing) of variable definitions for methods and operators on these variables (i.e. information regarding an instance of a component)").

In the remarks, the applicant has argued substantially that:

3) Sarkar does not disclose or suggest a method to determine whether an instance of a component is contained by a container, on p. 11:29-12:1

Examiner's response:

3) The examiner disagrees with the applicants characterization of the applied art. Sarkar, col. 5:49-51 discloses that "comparison operators are defined to compare ... objects (i.e. components) for ... containment (i.e. determining whether an instance of a component is contained by a container)".

In the remarks, the applicant has argued substantially that:

4) Sarkar does not disclose determining whether any other contained component desires to modify information regarding the instance of the component, on p. 12:3-5.

Examiner's response:

4) The examiner disagrees with the applicants characterization of the applied art. Sarkar discloses that "Java applets (i.e. a contained component) can be downloaded for decomposing (i.e. modifying) one web object into many parts", at col. 5:54-56, and the

information regarding the instance of the component must be modified as well, during this process.

In the remarks, the applicant has argued substantially that:

5) Sarkar is silent concerning any implementation of an interface, (such as a type descriptor filter service interface), for manipulating the information, on p. 12:19-24.

Examiner's response:

5) The examiner disagrees with the applicants characterization of the applied art. Sarkar discloses that "Java applets (provide the interface) ... for decomposing (i.e. modifying) one web object into many parts", at col. 5:54-56, and the information regarding the instance of the component must be modified as well, during this process.

While Sarkar does not mention a type descriptor filter service interface, the function performed by the type descriptor filter service interface, of the instant application is performed by the Sarkar system. Furthermore, nonfunctional descriptive material, such as a specific name for a function, does not distinguish an application over the prior art.

In the remarks, the applicant has argued substantially that:

6) Sarkar does not disclose storing the information regarding the instance of the component, on p. 12:25-26.

Examiner's response:

6) Sarkar discloses "Java applets ... for decomposing (i.e. modifying) one web object into many parts ... and then storing in a database", at col. 5:54-57, and the information regarding the instance of the component must be modified and stored as well, during this process.

In the remarks, the applicant has argued substantially that:

7) Sarkar is silent with regard to any teaching of a development tool, on p. 13:16-17.

Examiner's response:

7) Sarkar discloses "object creation ... (and) object life cycle management" at col. 2:54-55, and development tools are used to create and manage objects.

In the remarks, the applicant has argued substantially that:

8) Sarkar is silent with regard to a type descriptor adapted to access metadata associated with a software component, the software component operative to dynamically provide information associated with the software component to the development tool to facilitate application development, on p. 13:17-20.

Examiner's response:

8) Sarkar does disclose the functionality of a type descriptor for accessing information regarding an instance of a component (e.g. Sarkar col. 12:42-61, "application logic (is) defined in the form of object packages (i.e. components)

comprising: ... (a) type definition consist(ing) of variable definitions for methods and operators on these variables (i.e. information regarding an instance of a component)"), and "dynamic information retrieval", at col. 1:52-53.

While Sarkar does not mention a type descriptor, the function performed by the type descriptor, of the instant application is performed by the Sarkar system.

Sarkar discloses "object creation ... (and) object life cycle management" at col. 2:54-55, and development tools are used to create and manage objects.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andre R. Fowlkes whose telephone number is (703)305-8889. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (703)305-4552. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

7. After October 25, 2004, the examiner can be reached at new telephone number (571) 272-3697, and the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3695.

ARF

WEI Y. ZHEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

ZHEN
EXAMINER